Project MUSE

SOCIAL THOUGHT & COMMENTARY

Museums and Globalization

Saloni Mathur
University of California, Los Angeles

It has now been almost fifteen years since Rosalind Krauss published her influential essay on the "cultural logic of the late capitalist museum" which identified a profound shift in both the identity of museums, and the increasingly corporate nature of the contexts in which they operate.[1] From our vantage point today in the twenty-first century, museums appear to have completed this shift and firmly entered a new era of existence. Everywhere around us we see an increased public interest in museums, and a heightened role and renewed visibility for them in our society. Every year seems to bring either a new museum controversy, like the *Sensation* exhibit in Brooklyn, or a new mega-museum itself, always bigger and better than the last, like the Getty Center in Los Angeles, the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, or the Tate Modern in London. It is widely recognized that museums are central to urban redevelopment, and that the museum commission for an architect is considered the capstone of an architectural career. At the same time, the most recent economic downturn has led the media to increasingly speculate that museums are suffering from an identity crisis today, perched precariously at the financial brink while over-marketing their collections and sacrificing their institutional integrity.[2] So what exactly is the nature of this new era, and how should

we critically approach these numerous and often contradictory trends? Clearly, there is no "pure" oppositional practice vis a vis the contemporary museum, that is to say, no museological context wholly uncontaminated by the circuits of capitalism, or the history of power of the western museum. How, then, should we begin to assess the range of emergent museum practices and counter-practices within an era of globalization? What standards of judgment are appropriate for this kind of critical task? And what is the role of the museum in the new public sphere dominated by globalization? Such questions, I argue, point to the necessity of a global perspective in a critical approach to museums today, one that is not exclusive to the logic of the art museum, but rather grounded in the dynamics of a broader emergent culture of exhibiting, and situated within a historical frame. By briefly examining the international practices of the Guggenheim Museum, in particular, I offer in this essay one critical approach to the phenomenon of the "globalising museum," and suggest the value of a postcolonial perspective for a museum studies that is relevant to the twenty-first century.

The McGuggenheim Effect

As Krauss recognized, the new era of the late capitalist museum was perhaps best embodied by the figure of Thomas Krens, the aggressive director of the Guggenheim Museum, who became somewhat of a Donald Trump or a Bill Gates of the museum world. Krens earned this reputation during the 1990's by presiding over a major expansion of the museum, an initiative he called the "Global Guggenheim," which many feel was unprecedented in the art museum world. When Krens arrived at the Guggenheim in 1988 at the age of forty-two, with an MBA from Yale instead of the requisite doctorate in Art History, the museum consisted of the famous Frank Lloyd Wright building in New York and a small subsidiary collection in Venice. Under Krens, the Guggenheim built new branches in New York's Soho, Berlin, Las Vegas and of course Bilbao, and pursued much-hyped additional projects in Venice, Brazil, Russia, and lower Manhattan. In an interview with Forbes Magazine in 1998, Krens continued to tick off the places he wished to see more Guggenheims installed: "Two or three institutions in South America," he boasted, as well as East Asia, South Asia, the Middle East, and Africa.[3] Such bravado also drove several blockbuster shows at the New York Guggenheim under Krens like *The Art of the Motorcycle* in 1998 and *Giorgio Armani* in 2000/2001, an exhibition consisting famously of clothing made by the fashion designer. The official sponsor of the latter was *In Style*

magazine, but Armani himself made an individual gift—reportedly fifteen million dollars—to the museum. Similarly, *The Art of the Motorcycle* was sponsored by BMW, one of the manufacturers on display. "What can I do?," said Krens unapologetically to the Forbes Magazine interviewer at the time. "It would be better if an oatmeal company supported the motorcycle show, but they are not particularly interested in motorcycles." "Our success," he added, "is a function of our authenticity. We are not for sale."[4]

Krens' language, notorious for its economic and corporate idioms, already seems oddly dated. Today it is widely recognized that the Guggenheim Museum's bubble burst at the height of its hype, in a manner reminiscent of the dot.com collapse witnessed in the 1990's. The story of the museum's financial collapse, dubbed "Guggenron" by the *Village Voice*, was well rehearsed in the mainstream media: the events of September 11, 2001, in particular, led to a sharp drop in tourism and attendance at many Guggenheim Museum locations virtually overnight, which in turn resulted in major cutbacks to its operating budget, the cancellation of planned exhibitions, massive staff layoffs, the closing of its Soho and Las Vegas sites, and the shelving of all plans to build more mega-museums around the world. However dramatic these events, the media's announcement of a new identity crises for America's museums based on the death of the expansionist model, is undoubtedly premature.[5] Here, I wish to shift the focus away from the museum's current economic woes in order to revisit another set of processes embodied in the case of Krens and the whole unsettling phenomenon of McGuggenheim in general—processes that I would suggest are interlinked, emergent, and indicative of wider trends. These processes, I argue, are part of our contemporary "exhibitionary landscape," to paraphrase Tony Bennett's formulation of the nineteenth century environment into which museums were born.[6] They are significant because they situate the changing global context for museums today, and are therefore crucial, as I aim to demonstrate, to the project of constructing a critical museum studies for the twenty-first century. The first is the process of corporatization vis a vis the museum, and the second is the issue of global expansionism: let me now briefly elaborate them in this order.

Numerous controversies in the past two decades have exposed the hidden agendas of corporate sponsorship and challenged the presumed "neutrality" of the museum. And yet, the collaboration between Armani and the Guggenheim in the late 1990's presented a new kind of relationship between museums and corporations rather *unlike* those we had seen before. For instance, for its 1997 show called *Endangered! Exploring a World at Risk*, the

American Museum of Natural History launched a major ad campaign in collaboration with the toy store giant FAO Shwartz, who sold plush toy versions of all the endangered species featured in the exhibit. Later that year the museum boasted a flashy new dinosaur exhibit called *The Lost World*, which shared its title and advertising budget with the Steven Spielberg film of the same name.[7] Increasingly, it seemed that museums were not only being sponsored by corporations, but that their practices were becoming entirely interwoven with a corporate model, effectively blurring the boundaries between the world of museums, the world of Hollywood, the world of fashion design, while also creating a convergence of interests between these powerful economic sectors. The "blockbuster exhibition," for instance, is a vocabulary borrowed from the film industry and would seem to epitomize this trend. These kinds of collaborations, along with the expansion of museum facilities—in particular, the ascendance of the museum restaurant and shop, and the restructuring of professional practices like the turn to MBA's instead of Phd's—have given rise to a recurring complaint in the mainstream media that museums are increasingly transforming into theme parks or shopping malls, those vulgar symbols of commodity culture that are consumer-driven and unmistakably low. While these concerns may have some validity, they are not particularly new. In fact, they can be seen as part of a long history of anxiety about the museum's surrender to the forces of commerce, a history that is almost as long as the story of the institution itself. Indeed, for a writer such as Walter Benjamin, the museum was entirely enmeshed in the "spectacle of commodity culture" that transformed society in the nineteenth century, and arguably has more in common with its cousins—the department store, the arcade, the world's fair—than it has ever wanted to admit. What *is* new, it seems to me, is not the fact that museums are behaving increasingly like corporations, regardless of their profitability, but that they are, in the case of the Guggenheim, behaving like *multinational* corporations.

Museums and Globalism

This multinationalist component of Thomas Krens' rhetoric—that is, his commitment to global expansionism, his desire for Guggenheims to proliferate in all parts of the world, in short, the "Mc" part of the McGuggenheim phenomenon—is by far the most disturbing aspect of his vision for the cultural institution, and an ideology that he has sustained in public even after its financial failures. Firstly, it seems reasonable to ask, does the world *really need*

Guggenheims in Asia, Africa, South America, and so on? And secondly, if so, whose interests will this serve? Krens' desire for the project of a Global Guggenheim contains an astonishing disavowal of the autonomous spaces of cultural activity that exist in the non-western world, not to mention the great range and diversity of cultural institutions that characterize this landscape. As the *Forbes Magazine* writer noted, Krens talks suspiciously like a Walt Disney executive, using phrases like "economies of scale," "brand awareness," and "taking the product down the road." The "product" or "brand" here is presumably the museum itself; or rather, a particular kind of experience of the museum that Krens wants to export—in much the same way that the Big Mac has been exported and made available to the world as a uniform commodity. Are we witnessing, then, yet another instance of the globalizing ambitions of the New York art world? Is this simply the latest episode in a history of hegemony that begins with abstract expressionism during the cold war, that New York-based style that spread around the post-war world with the speed and confidence of global capital itself?[8]

Yes and no. Obviously, these current trends are no longer bound up in the historical conditions of the cold-war and the specific ideologies that this era produced. Instead, new forces shaping today's global political economy like globalization, the opening of world markets that has resulted in the increased mobility of people, capital, goods, and ideas, the revolution in computer and communications technologies, the rise of religious and ethnic nationalisms, the increased militarism and global power of the United States, the so-called "war on terror"—all of these processes have moved us firmly out of the cold war and into a global order of a new sort.[9] At the same time, in the past two decades we have seen a significant challenge to the authority of museums by indigenous peoples and other minority groups, and an increased attention by western museums to the contemporary arts of the non-western world. In short, new global relationships have resulted in different kinds of configurations of power and new kinds of political challenges to such power, and this has changed the dynamics between centers and margins that previously structured our exhibitionary world.

The recent upsurge of international biennials, especially in the non-western world, reflects this changing topography, and provides a good example of those emergent practices that Krens' discourse would seem to erase. In his short essay titled "Arrivederci Venice," Thomas McEvilley has explained how the third world biennials which began in the 1980's were initially seen as a radical challenge to the one hundred year old tradition of the Venice bienni-

al, that bastion of discrimination in the European art world. At their best, these "other" biennials were conceived through the vision for social justice of the international left; they were formulated in the wake of non-western anti-colonial struggles and third world revolutionary movements, and provided an alternative space of display for artists excluded from the Euro-western establishment. At their worst, the biennials—like those in Havana, Delhi, Dakar, or Cairo—have been criticized for mimicking modernist abstraction, been plagued by the systemic corruption of their countries, been co-opted by city promoters and the tourism industries of the host site, or have stiffened into their own centers of power involving new gestures of inclusion and exclusion. As George Baker has suggested, many of the larger biennials now seem to adhere to the logic of spectacle enacting "phenomenological violence" upon their spectators and creating an increasingly uniform aesthetic experience.[10] Others, like Documenta curator, Okwui Enwezor, argue that the biennial phenomenon nevertheless contains the possibility of a paradigm shift in which "we as spectators are able to encounter many experimental cultures, without wholly possessing them."[11] At the same time, in the case of India, an event like the New Delhi Triennial has allowed "other solidarities besides those of the nation, state, and national culture" to become possible, according to Indian critic and curator, Geeta Kapur.[12] As Kapur suggests, the third world biennials may not have fulfilled their utopian mandates of counter-hegemonic revolutionary change. In them, however, we may see the formation of a new internationalism, and the creation of new alliances, exchanges, and infrastructures that continue to reshape our art historical maps.

My argument, therefore, is that we need to distinguish between different kinds of globalisms that appear to co-exist in our current exhibitionary landscape. The latter refers to our contemporary global complex of display-based phenomena including (but not exclusive to) the broad range of biennials and triennials, mega-museums, blockbuster exhibitions, festivals of culture, world expositions, and science, natural history, and anthropology museums that co-exist and compete at any given moment. We need, for instance, to identify those cosmopolitan practices that are socially progressive, worldly, enlightened, and that potentially challenge the dominance of western cultural institutions, and distinguish them from the western *pretensions* to globalism by local elites like Thomas Krens or George Bush. We need to interrogate and reject false claims to the latter, such as the controversial joint statement on "universal museums" issued by the directors of eighteen major museums in Europe and America, including the British Museum, the Louvre, and the Met in

New York.[13] The statement argued that these venerable institutions were "universal museums" because their collections transcended national boundaries and served a public not belonging to a single nation-state. The directors therefore announced their right to keep objects acquired under all historical circumstances, strategically deploying the notion of the universal museum to counter bids for restitution and repatriation (the most visible of which has been the Greek effort to have the so-called Elgin Marbles returned to them from the British Museum). The statement, referred to by one observer as the "George Bush approach" to international cultural property, thus hid behind the concept of the universal museum while reactivating the long history of Euro-western power within which museums have emerged and evolved. For our purposes the statement also dramatizes the need to interrogate museological practices which lay claim to that which is "global" or "universal." In this case, as in the case of the Global Guggenheim, we should ask: what kind of ideological work is sustained by this particular notion of the "global" or "universal"?

A seriously global approach to museums must extend its gaze beyond a mere interest in the "successful" exportation of the Euro-American institution to other parts of the world, and insist on a wide-ranging view of museological forms, practices and situations that would highlight different topographies of power. For example, the issue of collection and preservation of universal cultural heritage raised by the joint statement on universal museums should be measured against the contemporary *destruction* of cultural heritage in Afghanistan and Iraq, in the form of the looting of the Iraq National Museum in Baghdad and *its* repercussions in the international arena. If the goal is to develop a critical practice on a global scale, then we must begin to construct new links and make less-than-obvious conceptual connections between different manifestations of museological activity. Walter Benjamin's famous dictum that "there is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism" seems particularly instructive for such a task.[14] In addition to celebrating the greatness of the museum's civilizational achievements, we need to consider the unsettling politics of the destruction of museums during periods of war and imperial violence, and bring both of these impulses surrounding the museum into our critical and analytic frames.

Such a project must also be historically conceived; that is to say, a critical analysis of contemporary museological practices can only be understood in terms of the colonial conditions of modernity through which our history of exhibiting has emerged. For instance, the awareness by critics of a contemporary return to the monumental architecture that characterized museums in

the nineteenth century would seem to necessitate a simultaneous return to the imperial ideologies that supported these structures within the European metropole. For the history of collecting and display at "the center" is deeply intertwined with the historical experiences and material cultures of the margins: it is a history that, in Said-ian terms, demands a contrapuntal account.[15] Scholars across the humanities and social sciences have increasingly begun to map the constitutive effects of the history of colonial relations on the collections and institutions of *both* the metropole and the colony, bringing a uniquely cosmopolitan perspective to the cultural production of the modern era.[16] Not only has such a critical genealogy restored a picture of global interdependence to the modern history of cultural display, it has also begun to illuminate some of the problems and politics of contemporary exhibitions and our conceptual strategies in the postcolonial world.

Towards a Postcolonial Museum Studies

The recent upsurge of non-western biennials; the desire on the part of Thomas Krens to install Guggenheims all over the world; the destruction of heritage at the Iraq National Museum; the reactionary notion of a "universal museum;" the conceptual inroads made possible by postcolonial criticism—all of these are instances of a changing world landscape that must affect the way we construct a critical museum studies for the twenty-first century. A critical approach to the museum at this juncture, should build upon the intellectual contribution of what has come to be known as "the new museology," for this body of literature wide-ranging as it is, concerned loosely with thematics of museums and representation, histories of exhibiting and display, and museums and minority groups, has done much in the past two decades to challenge the role of museums as institutions which reflect and serve the dominant culture.[17] However, a critical museum studies should go a step further to produce curators, thinkers, and cultural critics who are alert to the social processes of our time: we should learn to think, for instance, about the ideologies of globalization, the complexities of the nation-state, the unfinished careers of modernity and postmodernity, and the links between culture and power, to name only a few of the pressing themes that are relevant to an account of the museum.

To put it slightly differently, a critical museological project must examine the cultural, historical, and political atmosphere of the societies in which museums operate, and that shape their agendas and exhibition practices. And

this project can only be significant, in my view, if it is undertaken through a global and comparative frame. We should be asking how, for instance, museums in New Zealand, Australia, India, Japan, Korea, Brazil, and so on, are grappling with their specific contexts. We should learn to ask, for example: "How are notions of citizenship and democracy being re-inscribed at the Black History Museum in Detroit, Michigan?" Or, "Can we compare the Holocaust Museum in Washington with the Mashantucket Pequot Museum in Connecticut because they both tell history from the 'point of view of its victims?'" as Chris Steiner has suggested.[18] Or, "What is excluded from the narrative of the modern at the new Tate Modern in London?" Or, "Why are museums so powerful today? And why has this power so long been invisible?"

The kind of cultural criticism that we call postcolonial is indispensable to the task of thinking critically about discrepant kinds of global practices, and is therefore an important set of perspectives, I believe, for a critical museum studies in the twenty-first century. The term "postcolonial" is of course overdetermined, and many scholars have raised objections to its application across uneven histories, societies, and geopolitical realities. As I have argued elsewhere, the debates that have emerged in my own research area, South Asian studies, have been very influential in postcolonial thinking, and have made South Asia a paradigmatic site for postcolonial theory, in part due to a long history of interdisciplinary collaboration in this area, and in part due to the sobering geopolitical crises that have shaped the region in the past few decades.[19] One result has been a radical and highly self-conscious body of scholarship concerned with issues that are relevant well beyond the borders of South Asian nation states: issues such as the relationship between power and knowledge in the archive, the question of how to write history itself, the problem of the difference of non-western modernity, the challenge of the colony to our theories of global capitalism, and the problem of conceptualizing the complex legacy of colonial history for our postcolonial world.

Museum studies in the twenty-first century would be well served by radically re-orienting itself towards these larger themes. For instance, museum studies must learn to take seriously the issue that postcolonial thinkers have called "the problem of Europe," a problem not merely of Eurocentricism in the North American academy, although this is not un-important. Instead, as Dipesh Chakrabarty has argued, it is the tendency to conceive of Europe as "the primary habitus of the modern," which relegates non-western history to a mere episode in Europe's history, and explains the development of non-western culture as an incomplete historical transition to the modern.[20]

Significantly, Chakrabarty's argument calls not for *less* of a focus on Europe but *more*—not a decentering of Europe, but rather a *re-positioning* of its knowledge practices, and a closer look at its interpenetration into all aspects of life in the non-European world. This raises important questions for the critical study of the museum or for critical curatorial work, because the knowledge paradigms of the museum are a classic product of European modernity, and would appear to demand the repositioning that Chakrabarty suggests. How, for example, should we acknowledge the dominance of western museums, while also subverting—or at least not reproducing—their history of universalizing and totalizing claims? What kinds of critical practices will this require? What kinds of exhibitions should we be seeking? In short, what kinds of narratives should we imagine and tell?

Museum studies, if conceived in this way, would have a broad interdisciplinary relevance in the humanities and social sciences, but it would not lose sight of the museum itself as a complex social and political institution. Museums today are immersed in a culture of change whereby each new exhibition or practice introduces new issues and problems that, in turn, make visible the fault lines in our society in new and different ways. A case-study approach, drawn from the model of Law School, is thus well-suited for museum studies pedagogy because each new museological case sets fresh precedents and parameters for future thinking. Like the Law School, the ultimate objective of a case-by-case analysis would be to move closer towards a more just result. Students should be encouraged to imagine, in other words, exhibitions we might see as more humane or more just; a critical museology should teach, in short, the capacity for social justice in our cultural institutions.

It is potentially an exciting time for rethinking the long relationship between museums and the disciplinary practices of the academy. For museum studies at this conjuncture can no longer be *only* about knowing objects and mounting displays. It must aspire to define a new kind of critical training addressing the relationship between theory and practice, between the past and the present, between institutions and communities, and between different and uneven trajectories of modernity. It is a training necessarily grounded in history. It is a training that sees the "global" as a methodological problem. It is a training that is theoretically informed. It is a training designed to produce critical thinkers who will imagine alternatives to dominant practices. Only then can we begin to displace, if not *replace* one day, the likes of Thomas Krens.

ENDNOTES

[1]Rosalind Krauss, The Cultural Logic of the Late Capitalist Museum. *October*. Fall, 1990. pp. 3-17.

[2]See, for instance, Michael Kimmelman, An Era Ends for the Guggenheim, *The New York Times*. December 6, 2002, and New York's Bizarre Museum Moment, *The New York Times*. July 11, 2004.

[3]Museums, Inc., *Forbes Magazine*. January 8, 2001.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Michael Kimmelman, An Era Ends for the Guggenheim, *The New York Times*. December 6, 2002, and New York's Bizarre Museum Moment, *The New York Times*. July 11, 2004; Herbert Muschamp, When Art Puts Down a Bet in a House of Games, *The New York Times*. April 14, 2002; Lee Rosenbaum, The Guggenheim Regroups: The Story Behind the Cutbacks, *Art in America*. February 2003, pp. 43-47; Deborah Solomon, Is the Go-Go Guggenheim Going, Going….?. *The New York Times Magazine*. June 30, 2002. pp. 36-41.

[6]Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

[7]Stephen Dubin, *Displays of Power: Memory and Amnesia in the American Museum*. New York: New York University Press, 1999. p. 7.

[8]See Serge Guillbault, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

[9]For Hardt and Negri, for instance, the new paradigm governing the global order is "empire," a systemic condition—defined as a-historical, triumphant, and self-legitimating—in which power is conceived as limitless, diffuse, indeterminate, and absolute. See Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's influential argument in *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

[10]George Baker, The Globalization of the False: A Response to Okwui Enwezor, *Documents*. #23, 2004. pp. 20-25.

[11]Okwui Enwezor, On Mega-Exhibitions and the Antinomies of a Transnational Global Form, *Documents*. #23, 2004. pp. 2-19.

[12]Geeta Kapur, Strategies for Curating in the Postmodern Scenario. *Art India*. 4(2), 1999. p. 50.

[13]See *Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums* on the British Museum website: *http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/newsroom/current2003/ universalmuseums.html*

[14]Cited in Susan Buck-Morss, *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left*. London and New York: Verso, 2003. p. 104.

[15]Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*. New York & London: Vintage, 1993.

[16]Arjun Appadurai and Ivan Kopytoff (eds.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986; Tim Barringer and Tom Flynn (eds.), *Colonialism and the Object: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum*. London: Routledge, 1998; Annie Coombes, *Reinventing Africa: Museums, Material Culture and the Popular Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press; Tapati Guha-Thakurta, *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003; Nicholas Thomas, *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture and Colonialism in the Pacific*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

[17]Michael Ames, *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1992; Douglas Crimp, *On the Museum's Ruins*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993; Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London & NY: Routledge, 1995; Reesa Greenberg et. al. (eds.), *Thinking About Exhibitions*.

New York: Routledge, 1995; Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*. London & NY: Routledge, 1992; Ivan Karp and Steven Lavine (eds.), *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991; Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museum, and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998; Andrew McCLellan, *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth Century Paris*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994; Donald Preziosi and Claire Farago (eds.), *Grasping the World: The Idea of the Museum*. London: Ashgate, 2004; Donald Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth's Body: Art, Museums, and the Phantasms of Modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003; Daniel Sherman and Irit Rogoff (eds.), *Museum Cultures: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994; Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993; Peter Vergo (ed.), *The New Museology*. London: Reaktion Books, 1989; Stephen Weil, *Rethinking the Museum and Other Meditations*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990.

[18]Christopher B. Steiner, Out of the Curiosity Cabinet. *Connecticut College Magazine*. Winter, 2000.

[19]Saloni Mathur, "History and Anthropology in South Asia: Rethinking the Archive." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. #29, 2000. pp. 89-106.

[20]Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.